

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Submitted herewith for approval by the examiner are two (2) Replacement Sheets of drawings. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated September 13, 2005, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office action, a number of objections in connection with the drawings and the specification regarding missing reference numerals have been raised. Moreover, claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 21 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brauchler in view of Nakamura. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brauchler in view of Nakamura and further in view of Hubbell. And claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-19 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,941,782.

By the above amendment the specification and the drawings have been amended to include the missing reference numerals pointed out by the examiner, and submitted herewith for approval by the examiner are two Replacement Sheets of drawings. No new matter has been added.

Moreover, claims 1-20 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the Section 101 double patenting

rejection moot.

Claim 21 is amended and it now requires "a programmable logic controller, a multi-axis controller, and feedback devices including a position sensor for each of said first inner and outer punches, and means for controlling movement of said first inner and outer punches individually along said common axis in response to the sensed position of said first inner and outer punches to thereby form a complex shape." No new matter is believed to have been added by this amendment. Support for this amendment is found in the specification on, for example, page 8, last paragraph, and the drawing figures. None of the cited prior art references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or shows these limitations as now required by claim 21. Therefore, it is believed that claim 21 is patentable over the prior combination. Claims 22-28 are dependent from claim 21 and are therefore believed to be allowable for the same reasons as claim 21.

The prior art references made of record by the examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claims as amended. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated September 13, 2005, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 21-28 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicants

respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD



By: _____
Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 1/13/06